```
BEVERLY SALHANICK, ESQUIRE
   BEVERLY SALHANICK, ESQUIRE P.C.
   Nevada Bar No. 002786
   2001 S. Jones, Suite I
 3
   Las Vegas, Nevada 89146
   (702) 227-0787
 4
   (702) 579-9965 fax
   Beverly@Salhanicklaw.com
 5
   Attorney for Plaintiff
 6
 7
 8
                    IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 9
                        FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA
10
11
   METABOLIC RESEARCH, INC.,
                                       ) Case No.: 2:09-CV-02453-JCM-PAL
        a Nevada corporation,
12
                                       ) ORDER RE: DEFENDANTS' SPECIAL
             Plaintiff,
                                       ) MOTION TO DISMISS AND
13
                                         COUNTERMOTION FOR STAY
        VS.
14
   SCOTT J. FARRELL, MICHAEL
   CAMPOS, THOMAS HESS, SARA
15
   JORDAN, DOES I-V, inclusive,
16
   DOE ENTITIES VI-X, inclusive,
17
        Defendants.
18
                              Motion to Dismiss and Plaintiff's
19
        Defendants'
                      Special
2.0
   Countermotion for Stay having come on regularly for hearing, Beverly
21
   Salhanick, Esquire, appearing for Plaintiff, Bevin Allen, Esquire of
22
   Khorrami Pollard & Abir, LLP and Jennifer A. Carrollo, Esquire of the
23
   law firm of Springel & Fink, LLP, the Court having reviewed the
2.4
   pleadings and papers on file and having heard the arguments of
2.5
   counsel, and good cause appearing,
        THE COURT FINDS:
26
27
        1. Nevada case law is controlling.
28
```

Case 2:09-cv-02453-JCM-PAL Document 38 Filed 04/30/10 Page 2 of 3

- 2. That N.R.S. 41.650 sets out the definition of good faith in matters regarding the Nevada Anti-SLAPP statute.
- 3. That N.R.S. 41.627 defines good faith communication in furtherance of right to petition in three distinct situations.
- 4. That the demand letter at issue does not fall within any of the situations described in N.R.S. 41.627
- 5. That based on <u>John v Douglas County School District</u>, 125 Nev. Adv. Op. No. 55, 219 P.3d 1276 (2009), headnote 6, the Nevada Anti-SLAPP statute does not apply.
- 10 6. That the litigation privilege is governed by Nevada law and does not apply in this instance.
- 7. That there is no basis for a stay of this proceeding.
- 13 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Defendants' Special Motion to
- 14

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25 |
- 26
- 27
- 28

	Case 2:09-cv-02453-JCM-PAL Document 38 Filed 04/30/10 Page 3 of 3
1	Dismiss is denied.
2	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Countermotion for Stay is
3	denied.
4	DATED this $\frac{30\text{th}}{\text{day of April, 2010.}}$
5	
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SUDGE
8	Submitted by:
9	BEVERLY SALHANICK, ESQ., P.C.
10	
11	/s/ Beverly Salhanick Beverly Salhanick, Esquire
12	Nevada Bar #002786 2001 S. Jones, Suite I
13	Las Vegas, Nevada 89146 Attorney for Plaintiff
14	
15	Counsel submitting this document certifies as follows:
16	I have delivered a copy of this proposed order to all counsel who appeared at the hearing, any unrepresented parties who appeared ant
17	the hearing, and each has approved or disapproved the order, or faile to respond, as indicated below:
18	
19	Bevin Allen, Khorrami Pollard & Abir, LLP-disapproved
20	Jennifer A. Carrollo, Springel & Fink-disapproved
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	T:\WPDOCS\M.DIR\Metabolic Research\Ferrell\NV Litigation\M to Dismiss\Order Denying Motion to Dismiss
	2.wpd 3